

APPLICANT(S): Baruch et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/005,314  
FILED: December 7, 2001  
Page 4

### **REMARKS**

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 20 – 26, 28, and 30 - 32 are pending in the application. Claims 20 – 26, 28, and 30 - 32 have been rejected. No claims have been amended.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

#### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20 – 24, 26, 28 and 30 – 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Stammli et al. (US 6,839,670) in view of Brown et al. (US 6,377,922).

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner responded to the Arguments presented in the previous Response with respect to this rejection. In the previous Response, Applicants said:

“Stammli et al. do not teach nor suggest performing speech recognition for non-dialing features. The addition of Brown et al. does not help because Brown et al. ties the choice of recognizer to the current prompt and not to a feature of the phone.”

In the Examiner’s Response, he said:

“However, Stammli et al. specifically teach recognizing at least two different non-dialing features, including multiword commands (column 12, lines 45 – 47) and names or function words which are associated with non-dialing functions (such as a station frequency of a radio station list or a target location for navigation systems, column 12, lines 41 – 43 and 48 -53).”

APPLICANT(S): Baruch et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/005,314  
FILED: December 7, 2001  
Page 5

The Examiner added:

“While Stammeler et al. do not teach that each non-dialing feature is associated with a separate speech recognition engine that is specific to that function, Brown et al. disclose using multiple speech recognition engines that are each assigned to recognize a particular type of spoken utterance increases the accuracy of recognition results and allows recognition to proceed more quickly and with less disruption to the user (column 6, lines 29 – 36).”

Applicants agree in part. While Stammeler et al. may discuss non-dialing features, it has only two speech recognition units and thus, cannot have a separate speech recognition engine specific to each non-dialing feature. Moreover, despite the Examiner’s argument to the contrary, the addition of Brown et al. does not help, because Brown et al. also does not have recognition engines specific to each non-dialing feature, but rather, as the Examiner noted, to each type of input.

The combination of Stammeler et al. and Brown et al. creates a device which, for each feature, would require the many different engines of Brown et al. For example, the calendar feature would use the digit engine (or a number engine) of Brown et al. for the numbers of the dates but the limited vocabulary engine for the names of the months. Brown et al. indicates this in col. 4, lines 20 – 31, as follows:

“For example, in the airline reservation embodiment, the prompt could be ‘What is your account number?’ The account number can consist of all numbers or a combination of alpha-numeric characters. Associated with the stored prompt is the response identifier. The response identifier assigns at least one speech recognizer to a stored prompt in anticipation of the spoken utterance. Therefore, if system 100 anticipates receiving an alpha-numeric character as the spoken utterance for the user’s account number, the response parameter will assign speech recognizer A to recognize digits and speech recognizer B to recognize letters of the alphabet.”

In this quote, Brown et al. indicates that a prompt may have two recognizers assigned to recognize the input speech. This is opposed to the device of claims 20 and 28, which recite, *inter alia*:

APPLICANT(S): Baruch et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/005,314  
FILED: December 7, 2001  
Page 6

“at least two speech recognition engines each specific to one non-dialing feature of the device;”

Since the speech recognition engines of Brown et al. are not specific to one non-dialing feature of the device, Brown et al. cannot add such a capability to Stammeler et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 20 and 28 are allowable. Claims 21 – 24, 28 and 30 – 31 depend directly or indirectly from claims 20 and 28 and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 21 – 24 and 30 – 31 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 20 – 24, 28 and 30 - 31.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 25 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Stammeler et al. in view of Brown et al. and further in view of Official Notice.

The Official Notice is:

“Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously well known in the art to incorporate non-dialing features (such as a calendar) into a device such as a portable telephone, so that a separate device is not needed for each specific function (i.e. a separate calendar device, fax device, etc.)”

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection. As discussed hereinabove, until the present invention, speech recognition engines were designed for the type of input expected. The present inventors realized that each feature of a device could have its own speech recognition engine. Thus, the fact that portable devices previously included non-dialing features may be true. However, it didn't occur to anyone, until the present inventors, to make speech recognition engines specific to those non-dialing features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 25 and 32 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

APPLICANT(S): Baruch et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/005,314  
FILED: December 7, 2001  
Page 7

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

**Petition For Two-Month Extension Of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)**

The period for responding to the Final Office Action and Advisory Action was set to expire on April 23, 2006. Applicant hereby requests that the period for responding be extended by two (2) months, so as to expire on June 23, 2006. Accordingly, this response is being timely filed.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account Number 501380 in the amount of two hundred and twenty-five dollars (\$225.00) for the two-month extension fee for a small entity.

No additional fees are believed due. However, the United States Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account Number 501380 any amount which is necessary in connection with this filing.

Favorable action on this response is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Swirsky  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 45,148

ALPHAPATENT ASSOCIATES LTD.  
55 REUVEN ST.  
BEIT SHEMESH, ISRAEL 99544  
TEL. (US) 516-620-4572  
FAX. (US) 206-374-6672  
EMAIL: [dswirsky@alphapatent.com](mailto:dswirsky@alphapatent.com)